Docket No. US000396

## REMARKS

The Office Action mailed December 28, 2005 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 21-26 are added. No claims are amended. Claims 4-11 and 15 to 26 are pending, the independent claims being 4, 15 and 21.

Claims 4, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,929,849 to Kikinis.

Claim 4 recites, "... extracting... the data in the displayed multimedia advertisement..."

Kikinis fails to disclose or suggest this aspect of claim 4.

The Office Action is incorrect, at least in that, regardless of whether "the web links or 'data' of the web site are 'extracted," Kikinis lacks any disclosure or suggestion of ".

.. extracting ... the data in the displayed multimedia advertisement..."

In addition, the Office Action is incorrect in suggesting that a buffer is a "data file."

For at least the above reasons, Kikinis fails to anticipate the present invention as recited in claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The above failing of the Office Action is compounded in it rejection of claim 8.

Claims 5-7, 15-17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,713 to Kitsukawa et al. ("Kitsukawa").

Docket No. US000396

Claims 5-7 depend from claim 4. Kitsukawa relates to linking advertising to television scenes, but cannot make up for the shortcomings of Kikinis.

Claim 15 has the same above-quoted language from claim 4, and is likewise deemed patentable over Kikinis. Kitsukawa cannot make up for the shortcomings of Kikinis. The claims dependent from claim 15 are deemed to distinguish patentably over the applied references at least due to their dependency. It is additionally noted that the claim 16 rejection, due to similarities in the language of claims 8 and 16, suffers from the compounded difficulties noted above with regard to claim 8.

Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Kitsukawa and U.S. Patent 5,977,964 to Williams et al. ("Williams").

Claims 10 and 18 depend from claims 4 and 15, respectively. Williams fails to make up for the deficiencies in the other applied references. It is noted, in addition, with regard to claim 10, that the citation by the Office Action to "wishes to be aware" is a citation to the applicants' claim language; Williams has no disclosure or suggestion of our "alerting... when..." The latter feature appears to be assumed using impermissible hindsight.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kikinis in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099812 to Davis et al. ("Davis").

Claim 11 depends from claim 4. Davis, although relating to user profiles, cannot make up for the deficiencies in the other references applied in rejecting claim 11.

Docket No. US000396

New claim 20 finds support in the specification (e.g., page 12, lines 11-21), and distinguishes patentably over the prior art of record at least due to its reference to scene description.

New claims 21 and 22 find support in original claims 3 and 4.

New claim 23 finds support in the specification (e.g., page 16, lines 15-16).

New claim 24 finds support in the specification (e.g., page 11, lines 1-16).

New claims 25 and 26 find support in the specification (e.g., page 17, lines

15-18).

Docket No. US000396

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted, John Vodopia Registration No. 36,299

Date: February 8, 2006

By: Steve Cha Attorney for Applicants Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:

John Vodopia, Registration No. 36,299 US PHILIPS CORPORATION P.O. Box 3001 Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001

Phone: (914) 333-9624 Fax: (914) 332-0615